

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 607

CS 505 195

AUTHOR Gotcher, James M.
TITLE Who Should Judge CEDA Debate?
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (Winston-Salem, NC, April 11-14, 1985).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Competition; *Persuasive Discourse; *Qualifications; Rhetorical Criticism; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *CEDA Debate; Debate Format; *Debate Tournaments

ABSTRACT

The most common criticism of CEDA (Cross Examination Debate Association) debate tournaments voiced by coaches and students alike centers on the quality of judging. If the debater is completely unaware of the qualifications or credentials of the critic, he or she will be unable to fulfill the judge's expectations. Debates are then lost not on analysis, evidence, or logic, but on a lack of knowledge of the judge's preferences. A competent critic must possess three important qualities: (1) an understanding of the rules governing debate activity, (2) an understanding of logical thought, and (3) an analytical mind. This is not to suggest that tournament directors intentionally recruit ill-qualified judges, but they have a responsibility to those participating to provide the contestants with competent judges. The first step is to require competing schools to fulfill the "one judge per two teams standard" obligation. The tournament directors must also brief the judging pool on CEDA goals, speaking order, nature of the resolution, and the responsibilities of the various speakers. This can be accomplished by means of a review sheet, or practice sessions with judges several days before a tournament. (A sample judges review sheet is included.) (HTH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

[] Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ED265607

WHO SHOULD JUDGE CEDA DEBATE?

by

James M. Gotcher

Austin Peay State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James M. Gotcher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Southern Speech Communication Convention

1985

CS 505195

WHO SHOULD JUDGE CEDA DEBATE?

The most common criticism of CEDA debate tournaments is not that of scheduling, or punctuality or even the quality of the awards. The most common criticism voiced by coaches and students alike centers on the quality of judging.

As James Hallmark noted, a team can go 1-7 this weekend but 6-2 last weekend. They must be debating CEDA. You have to expect that in CEDA debate. (CEDA Yearbook, 1984). But do we really have to expect that? Concerned coaches advise their students that preparation is the key to success, but after one tournament a debater learns it is not preparation but, more often than not, it is judges' preference. Hallmark's question is clearly warranted: "What value is CEDA debate if, in one round, debaters are rewarded for research, analysis, and use of evidence, only to be punished in the next round for doing the same?"

Hallmark's question provides the impetus to this paper: "Who should judge CEDA debate?" The purpose of this paper is two-fold: 1) to identify the goals of CEDA; and 2) to propose procedures to be implemented to better prepare a judging pool that will help CEDA meet the identified goals.

The Goals

Jack Howe, in his brief explanation of CEDA, states that

"CEDA has managed to provide an alternative style for disillusioned debaters...The CEDA emphasis on communicative speaking and argumentation (as opposed to sole reliance on evidence) attracts students to debate for they can see a greater applicability of the speech skills that CEDA stresses to their own future careers than they could with the NDT styles" (p. 4).

Clearly, Howe proposes CEDA as being an alternative to NDT because it focuses on communicative abilities and argumentation skills. Nevertheless, Howe still views CEDA as debate.

Debate according to L. E. Norton (1982), "is referred to as argumentation bound by a set of rules; while argumentation is an oral presentation that emphasizes evidence and logical reasoning, with lesser attention given to emotional appeals." (p. 4). Therefore, one clear goal of CEDA should be logical reasoning supported with evidence and presented through effective communication--CEDA is debate.

A second goal of CEDA, identified by Miller and McVay, in the 1984 CEDA Yearbook, is that CEDA is an organization which stresses persuasion and audience adaptation. They indicate that CEDA can assume a leadership role by offering a comprehensive curriculum in the art of audience analysis and adaptation in academic debate.

Murphy and Ericson (1961) note that the ideal debater has the ability to speak convincingly. He/she has an awareness of what an

audience expects and is able to provide what it takes to convince that audience. A primary objective of CEDA is to enhance an individual's ability to be that ideal debater. To be able to adapt to the audience and present arguments persuasively.

The rationale of CEDA focusing on communication skills is grounded in the belief that NDT has developed a style that is uncommunicative. CEDA is an attempt to restore effective communication skills and audience analysis along with a balance among argument, analysis, and evidence.

As T. F. Sheckels (1984) notes, "Delivery in value debate tends to be slower; the use of jargon and shorthand is less prominent in value debate than in policy debate. Wit is encouraged more in value debate. In other words, behavior conducive to successful communication is far more prevalent in value debate than in policy debate" (p. 319). However, this does not mean that CEDA is persuasive speaking. CEDA is still debate and debate involves research, discovery, analysis, testing of facts, and the establishment of paradigms.

The Problem

With the two major goals of CEDA in mind--1) logical reasoning supported with evidence and 2) effective communication skills--I would now like to identify the problem caused by the lack of competent critics.

First, a disclaimer is in order. I am not suggesting a solution to all the problems inherent in locating qualified debate

judges but I am suggesting that steps can and should be taken to improve the quality of CEDA judges. The often prevailing attitude that "anyone can judge CEDA" has immensely harmed the educational value of non-policy debate and has the propensity of forcing some programs back to NDT debate. If CEDA is to continue to thrive it is crucial that we face the problem of qualified judges.

The problem of locating competent judges is well-known and can be documented by the reading of a few debate ballots. Locating qualified judges for CEDA is a very difficult process and it is no wonder that many coaches and students register complaints on the quality of judging. Realistically, however, the problem is understandable. First, consider how few people have ever debated, how few of these have debated in the CEDA format, how few of these you can find, and how few are willing to give up their time to judge. Second, consider the traditional judging pool--local lawyers, fellow faculty members, and anyone who has ever heard the term "debate", including graduate students, law school students, and the poor I.E. coach that is on stand-by. Clearly, the judging pool for CEDA becomes very small, very quickly. However, the problem is real--debaters are participating in a confusing activity partly due to the lack of qualified judges.

Debaters often walk into a round not knowing if the judge is an NDT judge, an ex-NDT debater, a flowing CEDA judge, a non-flowing CEDA judge, a lawyer, a speech teacher, a political science professor, an I.E. coach, or even someone's mother. Miller and McVay suggest that the CEDA debater should be able to adapt to the audience, but how realistic is this expectation if the debater has

no idea of what type of audience to adapt to. Thomas (1981, p. 340) notes that it is important to know the debate critic's paradigm, since failure to perform up to the judge's expectation may mean a loss.

If the debater is completely unaware of the qualifications or credentials of the critic, then how is he/she going to be able to fulfill the judge's expectations? Very often the debater is not even sure that the critic knows the speaking order much less a knowledge of the resolution. We expect our debaters to adapt to the audience but we fail to supply them the most basic information to make this possible.

The result of this situation is that debaters become confused, frustrated, and disenchanted. Debates are lost - not on analysis, evidence, or logic - but on a lack of knowledge of a judge's preference. Hair is not styled, clothes are not coordinated, nonverbals were distracting, speaking pace was too rapid, etc. I am not suggesting that appearance, attire, and posture are not vital to effective communication but they should not override analysis, organization, evidence and reasoning.

If we continue to promote a situation where style dominates substance and emotions win over logic, then we are condoning the very methods employed by politicians, businessmen and advertisers-- make it look good, do not worry about quality, just sell it. By promoting style over substance, we are encouraging students to create the illusion, an illusion that will work with most audiences. Arthur Kruger (1967) reaffirms this situation by noting:

At fairly regular intervals college debaters are criticized for their lack of ethos, their refusal to capitalize on pathos, and their insistence upon logos. They are told to use "ethical, emotional, and psychological" appeals if they want to be effective persuaders, and debate coaches are advised to provide instruction "in persuasion as an instrument of social control." (p. 295)

This attitude is repugnant and violates the very nature of debate.

Debate is an instrument that teaches the "law of rationality." "The law of rationality holds that a conclusion must be justified by relevant and sufficient evidence and that one who believes rationally tempers his acceptance of a conclusion in accordance with the kind of evidence offered to support it" (Kruger, p. 295). Debate teaches the student to look beyond the emotional appeal and examine the supporting evidence. However, if debaters are punished for using logic and rewarded for their use of emotions, then we are not teaching the law of rationality but rather the effective use of persuasion through extra-logical, psychological or emotional modes of proof. Kruger further notes that this approach "belittles rational processes, shows little faith in man's ability to govern himself, extols the techniques of the confidence man, presumes that the end justifies the means, ignores the consequences of social manipulations" (p. 296).

Debate should not be a training ground to promote attitude manipulation but it should be an arena where this manipulation is

uncovered and rationality dominates. In order for this arena to exist competent critics must balance emotions with evidence, analysis with persuasion, and style with organization.

Now, I am not suggesting that only trained debate judges can evaluate a CEDA round, but I am suggesting that debate is complex and a basic understanding of debate is necessary.

The Qualified Critic

Marvin Kleiau (1982) notes that a competent critic possesses three important qualities. First, a qualified critic must possess an understanding of academic debate. A competent judge needs to understand the rules governing the debate activity. The process of debate is very complex and it is unrealistic to expect a "layman" to render a qualified decision. You would not expect someone to referee a football game if he/she did not fully understand the rules of football, so why should college debaters be treated with less respect than college athletes?

Second, qualified critics need an understanding of logical thought. Some individuals are naturally rational. They tend to reason things out by evaluating the evidence on both sides. Others, however, are not so rational they may act on impulse. Debate requires a rational approach. Paradigms for evaluation are often created and it takes a logical mind to evaluate the application of the paradigm. It is even more important in CEDA debate for a critic to be able to evaluate debate paradigms because of the lack of theoretical grounding in CEDA debate.

And finally, a critic needs an analytical mind. A good debater can identify the strengths and weaknesses of arguments a critic needs the same ability. A competent critic needs to be trained in the art of analytical thinking. He/she needs to know the questions that should be asked. We must remember that the debate is judged within the mind of the critic and not in the minds of the two competing teams (Thomas, 1981, p. 341).

A qualified critic needs to possess a trained mind to be able to evaluate the quality of the proofs employed. If CEDA is to continue to stress logical reasoning supported with evidence, then the critic should be capable of rendering a qualified decision.

Possible Solutions

The preceding paragraphs could be considered very naive by merely identifying a problem that we all know and agree exists. Clearly, Tournament Directors do not go out of their way to recruit ill-qualified judges to render haphazard decisions on our teams. Yet, the problem of identifying and preparing qualified critics is real and steps must be taken to help resolve the situation.

Tournament Director's have a responsibility to those participating in the tournament to provide the contestants with competent judges. The first step to solving the problem is to require competing schools to fulfill their judging obligations. The one judge per two teams standard is well known and accepted but not always followed.

If a problem of competent judges does exist, it is due primarily to the failure of participating schools to fulfill their judging obligations. Without the competing schools providing an adequate judging pool for the Tournament Director to work with, it is unreasonable to expect the Tournament Director to be able to magically create a well-qualified judging pool. If complaints concerning "hired" judges are voiced, then the ones' voicing the complaints should be examined to see if they fulfilled their judging obligations.

Most coaches are guilty of not bringing enough qualified critics to cover their entries. It is easy to do. We are so caught-up in preparing teams for competition that we fail to arrange for additional critics. So, the Tournament Director is contacted and informed of a couple of teams that will be entered but it will be necessary to hire a judge. It only requires a few schools to commit this transgression and the Tournament Director is given a real problem.

The Tournament Director, of course, could reject the uncovered entries. This, however, can cause additional problems: feelings could be hurt; financial obligations might not be met; and the prestige of the tournament could be reduced by fewer entries. So more often than not the entries are accepted and the Tournament Director is forced to deal with the problem of locating qualified critics.

A possible solution to this situation is to limit a school to only two teams per tournament. Since CEDA only accepts the

top two teams per tournament per school this would not affect a school's CEDA standing. This would prevent schools from stacking a tournament (entering 5 or 6 teams) and it would increase the level of competition because schools would only enter their best teams. This is not the ultimate answer, however, since this rule could harm CEDA by limiting competition, and a school's poorer open teams and novice teams might be prohibited from travelling.

A second possible solution would be to charge outrageous fees for hiring judges (\$100 per uncovered team). If the Tournament Director is forced to have to locate qualified critics, it is quite possible payment may be expected. If the Tournament Director is required to pay \$10.00 per round, then the school causing the problem should have to pay to solve the problem.

Of course, the best solution from the Tournament Director's and the competing Schools' perspective is for schools to fulfill their judging obligations. Bring enough judges and stay for the required elimination rounds. It is boring to judge after your teams have been eliminated and it is a long ride home but fulfill your obligations. Do not force the Tournament Director to replace you (a competent critic) with someone less qualified because you want to go home.

Participating schools must take an active role in supplying qualified judges. Schools should strive to find a person that they would not object to as a judge for one of their own teams. Without the direct involvement of participating schools, the location of qualified judges will continue to plague CEDA. The most important

step in solving the problem is for participating schools to take an active role.--Bring Judges.

While the problem of a shortage of qualified judges may be generated by participating schools (very seldom is a sufficient judging pool formed by the participants), Tournament Directors often exacerbate the problem by not taking the necessary preparation steps to assure a competent judging pool. If a judge is placed in a CEDA round who does not understand the goals of CEDA, the speaking order, the nature of the resolution, and the responsibilities of the various speakers it is not the judge's fault but the Tournament Director's.

Frequently, Tournament Director's take the view that anyone can judge CEDA debate. This view is eloquently voiced by Steven Brydon in the 1984, CEDA Yearbook. Brydon argues that CEDA should be judged by someone other than debate judges.

"Attorneys are outstanding judges. Attorneys seem to have little tolerance for the undesirable practices that have begun to appear in CEDA debate. Subject matter experts might judge debates on economics, foreign affairs and the like. University faculty in communication and other disciplines, who are not involved in coaching debate, are certainly competent judges or argumentation and persuasion. If our debaters cannot adapt to audiences such as these, one wonders how much they are gaining from the activity". (p. 87)

Brydon seems to hold fast to the attitude "that anyone can judge CEDA debate." Brydon is not alone but if this attitude is to dominate CEDA, the solution to the problem of competent judges is relatively simple. CEDA debate should be considered as an extension of persuasive speaking and debate coaches should concentrate their efforts on persuasive strategies rather than argumentative paradigms.

Debate would violate the law of rationality and embrace John Bowers' (1966) concept of audience adaptation. According to Bowers, the important thing is that the speaker should adapt to the attitudes of the audience. He advises the speaker to use extreme, moderate, or neutral language depending upon whether the audience is friendly, or hostile, moderate or neutral. Bowers does not seem to be concerned with quality of the supporting material but the style used to present the material.

If we follow Brydon's and Bowers' suggestions, then debate would become a long commercial and the critic would merely vote for the "best" presentation. The evaluation of evidence, the creation of argumentative paradigms, the use of logical appeals, and the concept of clash would become irrelevant. The winner of the debate would be the team that creates the best illusion.

This shift in concentration would not only violate the identified goals of CEDA but it would change CEDA from debate to persuasive speaking; however, it could solve the problem of locating competent critics. As Brydon further illustrates, when debaters "enter the post-college world, as businesspersons, attorneys, politicians,

parents and just plain citizens, they need to adapt to a variety of audiences, not just trained debate coaches". (p. 87)

Brydon is indeed correct, audience adaptation is crucial, but as a businessperson, an attorney, a politician, a parent, or just a plain citizen rules and regulations are followed in the "real world." An attorney must follow the rules of the court. A businessperson the laws governing his/her occupation. A politician must maintain the public trust. A plain citizen must obey the laws and mores of the society. If the rules and regulations of any aspect of the "real world" are violated competent critics are enjoined and sanctions are issued. Why should debate be any different?

Debate is complex like the "real world" so why short-change our students because we are not willing to face the problem of locating competent critics? Certainly, it is much easier to say "debaters should be able to adapt to any audience," than it is to admit that a problem exists. But I think the time has come to face the problem and take the necessary steps to solve the problem. CEDA is indeed debate. Debate requires unique skills of the critic.

Nevertheless, since there is a shortage of critics competent in debate and a real scarcity of critics with a foundation in CEDA; then, the Tournament Director must utilize lay judges and make special preparations to identify and brief judges for a CEDA debate tournament.

Special Procedures for Lay Judges

First, we must assume that Tournament Directors will attempt

to identify and recruit critics that have the essential qualities recognized by Kleiau. Even Brydon agrees that the expanded judging pool must include competent non-debate critics.

A critic's competency could be determined by occupation, training, or expertise. Tournament Directors should try to contact and recruit critics that are "experts" or knowledgeable in the topic area. An most importantly, Tournament Directors should begin their search for qualified critics at least one month before the tournament. This early preparation will lessen the need to use anyone that is available. The preceding recommendations represent general common-sense steps in tournament preparation. The following recommendations require additional time and effort of the Tournament Director but will almost certainly improve the judging pool of a tournament and reduce the number of criticisms involving incompetent judges.

A Review Sheet. One procedure would be by preparing a simple review of CEDA rules incorporating the topic and essential aspects of CEDA theory. This review should not suggest that a critic must vote on any particular issue but would give everyone in the debate round equal footing. The judge could know what is important, the debaters could be given the same hand-out and they would know what the judge has been told, and coaches could suggest to their teams appropriate ways to handle issues given in these ground rules (Biggers and Gotcher, 1984, p. 82). With this review a critic would have a basic understanding of the rules, be informed of speaking order and speaker responsibilities, and at the very least have an idea of what is

going on.

The review sheet would provide uniformity of judging instructions and eliminate any bias that a Tournament Director might suggest when trying to persuade someone to judge a debate round on the spur of the moment. The review sheet would not be a substitute for debate experience but it would provide essential information for the lay judge. Attached is a sample review sheet.

Practice Sessions. The second procedure which requires even more time and effort is for Tournament Directors to meet with hired judges several days before a tournament. During this meeting, questions concerning CEDA debate could be answered and misgivings regarding a judge's competency could be discussed.

The Tournament Director could arrange for a practice debate where judges could receive "hands-on" experience and debaters would be able to better understand the issues relevant to a lay judge. This practice session should not be considered as a time to "train-a-judge" but CEDA procedures can be very confusing. An old NDT judge could be confused by the lack of a plan and the inclusion of cross-examination. The notion of prep-time can even be confusing to the debaters much less a lay judge. A critic who flows off-case arguments beside second affirmative constructive will have a difficult time finding his/her place in rebuttals.

Judging debate requires experience and information; therefore, it is the Tournament Director's responsibility to provide the essential and necessary information to the critic to enable him/her

to make a qualified decision. A review sheet can be beneficial, a practice session can be invaluable: these are just two modest steps that a Tournament Director should take in preparing an adequate judging pool.

Conclusion

Earlier in this paper, I suggested that debate is complex and that a critic must understand the rules and regulations governing debate, I still believe this premise. Tournament Director's cannot continue to be lackadaisical about assigning judges to CEDA, the attitude that anyone can judge CEDA must be revised.

The problem of incompetent decisions cannot be ignored. Students spend long hours in the library and devote precious time to preparing arguments and to practice sessions, it is the least we can do as coaches and Tournament Directors to ensure that they are evaluated by competent critics.

Participating schools must bring enough judges to cover their entries and they must stay for the required number of rounds. Tournament Directors must take the necessary steps in preparing and recruiting a competent judging pool.

CEDA is a wonderful activity but it will only remain viable if we face the problem of ill-qualified judges.

REFERENCES

- Biggers, T. and Gotcher, M. On consideration of judging in CEDA debate tournaments - A modest proposal. CEDA Yearbook, 1984, 80-84.
- Bowers, J. Language and argument. In G. R. Miller and T. R. Nilsen (eds.), Perspectives on Argumentation. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966.
- Brydon, S. R. Judging CEDA debate: A systems perspective. CEDA Yearbook, 1984, 85-88.
- Hallmark, J. R. Towards a paradigm for CEDA. CEDA Yearbook, 1984, 89-92.
- Howe, J. H. A brief explanation of CEDA. Executive Secretary of CEDA.
- Kleiau, M. D. The judge as critic. In C. Keefe, T. B. Harte, and L. E. Norton (eds.), Introduction to Debate, 1982, 249-253.
- Kruger, A. N. The ethics of persuasion: A re-examination. The Speech Teacher, 1967, 295-305.
- Miller, T. H. & McVay, K. R. An audience analysis curriculum: Its theory, practice and implications. CEDA Yearbook, 1984, 65-73.
- Murphy, J. J. & Ericson, J. M. The Debater's Guide. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1961.
- Norton, L. E. Nature and benefits of academic debate. In C. Keefe, T. B. Harte and L. E. Norton (eds), Introduction to Debate, 1982.

Sheckels, T. F. Debating: Applied Rhetorical Theory.

Thomas, D. A. Value resolutions, presumption, and stock issues.

Dimensions of Argument. Annadale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1981.

A Brief Introduction for Judges

About CEDA Debate

CEDA debate is a relatively new form of intercollegiate debate. It began on the west coast a little over ten years ago. The major difference between CEDA and traditional policy debate is the nature of the resolution. In traditional debate resolutions of policy are argued. In CEDA the resolutions are usually ones of value. This shift causes some changes in affirmative and negative approaches to the topic and some changes in debate theory.

A value proposition does not advocate a change and the affirmative team is not required to present a plan to implement the topic. Rather, the emphasis is on the defense of the truth or non-truth of the resolution as a whole. Affirmative teams may still offer examples or areas of the resolution as proof that the general statement is true. Negative teams will clash with the case presented by the affirmative but will also offer off-case attacks against the resolution. The affirmative may be asked to either defend or attack current thinking. The status quo is not the exclusive domain of the negative team.

Presumption may be either for or against the affirmative or it may be unimportant since no change is to be implemented. Traditional speaker duties with plan attacks in the second negative speech may be irrelevant since there is no plan. Off-case attacks are usually called value objections or counter values.

Time limits are 8 minutes for constructives, 3 minutes for cross examination, 4 minutes for rebuttals, and 8 minutes for prep time that each team may use when they please. Speaker points should indicate your evaluation of the debater. A poor debater should receive 20-22, average would be 23-25, and superior would be 26 or more. A value of 18 or less could be used as a harsh warning to a debater who has truly offended.

The Resolution: Resolved: that the United States is justified in providing military support to non-democratic governments.